DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 780 EC 301 527

TITLE	Leadership in a Time of Chaos: The Best Way To Predict the Future Is To Invent It.
INSTITUTION	National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Alexandria, VA.
PUB DATE	Dec 91
NOTE	17p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc. (NASDSE), 1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 320, Alexandria, VA 22314 ($50/year subscription).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT	Liaison Bulletin; v18 n1 Dec 1991
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cultural Differences; *Disabilities; *Educational Change; *Educational Objectives; Educational Technology; Elementary Secondary Education; Emotional Disturbances; *Leadership; Legal Responsibility; Meetings; Personnel Needs; Professional Associations; Public Policy; *State Departments of Education
IDENTIFIERS	*National Assn of State Directors of Special Educ

ABSTRACT

This bulletin edition presents highlights of the 1991 Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), held November 10-13 in Cincinnati, Ohio. The bulletin summarizes panel discussions that focused on how educational reform can meet the needs of students with disabilities, the establishment of a national agenda for students with serious emotional disturbances, specific problems involved in meeting requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, personnel needs, and multicultural issues. The bulletin also describes: (1) activities promoting NASDSE's role as a leader in educational technology; (2) the view from the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs; (3) model programs from New Jersey, Iowa, Virginia, Kentucky, Oklahoma, and New Hampshire; and (4) NASDSE achievements, challenges for the future, and governmental relations activities. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

LIAISON bulletin ...

A Publication of NASDSE, Inc.
(703) 519-3800

1800 Diagonal Road • Suite 320
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

VOLUME 18, NUMBER 1 DECEMBER 1991

ED349780

Leadership in a Time of Chaos: The Best Way to Predict the Future Is to Invent It

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W. Schipper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

NASDSE 1991 Annual Meeting Report

This special edition presents highlights of the 1991 Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Directors of Special Education held November 10-13 in Cincinnati, Ohio.

The purpose of this year's meeting, chaired by Steve Kukic (UT), NASDSE's 1991-92 president, was "to energize each of us and all of us, corporately, to internalize the challenge so eloquently stated in John Sculley's book ***Odyssey:*** 'The best way to predict the future is to invent it.' Given our backgrounds, expertise, and responsibilities, we State Directors of Special Education and our staffs are in unique positions to provide leadership in a strategic, yet student-centered manner."

Nearly 200 persons attended the Annual Meeting representing state education agencies, Regional Resource Centers, local education agencies, national organizations, institutions of higher education, and technical assistance centers. During the four-day meeting:

• Special educators and officials of key national organizations involved in educational reform discussed "Meeting the Needs of Students with Disabilities Through Reform." (see page 3)

• NASDSE reconfirmed its commitment to making educational technology a priority, with the preview of a new video, produced with support from an IBM grant. Apple Computer CEO John Sculley sent a video greeting to participants, and a special session demonstrated IBM products for daily living accessibility and therapy. (see page 4)

• Dr. Judy Schrag, director of OSEP, described OSEP's responses to key questions about student outcomes and accountability within the context of educational reform. (see page 5)

• State special education directors and mental health representatives for children and youth examined a national agenda for students with serious emotional disturbances. (see page 6)

• NASDSE linked with participants at a CEC conference in New Orleans on at-risk children and youth for a nationally telecast video teleconference on early interventions for students with behavioral and emotional problems. (see page 7)

• Concurrent sessions presented examples of reform at the state level: in the service delivery system, within the SEA, and in a partnership to pro-

EC 301527

The *Liaison Bulletin* © is published periodically by the National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc. (NASDSE), 1800 Diagonal Rd., King Street Station I, Suite 320, Alexandria, VA 22314

An annual subscription is available at a cost of $50/yr. by writing NASDSE at the above address, calling 703/519-3800 or via SpNet: NASDSE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

duce student outcome data. (see page 9)

• A panel of legal and program experts joined state directors to explore problems involved in meeting the needs of students with disabilities through Section 504. (see page 11)

• Multiple perspectives and responses on meeting personnel needs was the topic of a special session that analyzed statistical reports on teacher shortages and attrition. (see page 12)

• A general session looked at multicultural issues and minority over-representation in special education. (see page 13)

• Ray Horn, Ohio assistant superintendent of public instruction and former state director of special education, gave the welcoming address. NASDSE President Tom Gillung presented him with a special award of appreciation for his service to special education for more than 45 years. Also at the meeting were two other former Ohio state directors and past presidents of NASDSE: Amy Allen (1955) and Sam Bonham (1981).

• A special treat at the opening session were delightful songs by 8-year-old Erin Byrne, a third grade student in the Canton, OH, public schools, who has received the R.A. Horn Outstanding Achievement Award.

• Steve Kukic (UT) succeeded Tom Gillung (CT) as President of NASDSE. Patrick Campbell (CA) was elected president-elect. Jim Newby (OK), Gail Lieberman (IL) and James Tucker (PA) were elected to the Board of Directors. Others on the Board are Larry Gloeckler (NY), secretary-treasurer, and John Heskett (MO).

• At the final business meeting, Joe Ballard, CEC director of governmental relations, made a repeat presentation of CEC's award for outstanding public service to William B. Schipper, NASDSE executive director. The award was originally presented in April at the CEC annual meeting. Ballard said the honor recognized Schipper's creative public advocacy and effectiveness on behalf of exceptional children.

• NASDSE adopted the following mission statement:

> "NASDSE operates for the purpose of providing services to state agencies to facilitate their efforts to maximize educational outcomes for individuals with disabilities."

• The "Midwest" defeated "The Rest" in a NASDSE-Kukic Klassic BowlingTournament.

• The NASDSE Board of Directors took the following actions:

- Endorsed adoption of the Mental Health Special Education Coalition's proposed definition of "emotional or behavioral disorder," with the understanding that there are strong corollary movements within the mental health community and appropriate Congressional committees to develop entitlement concepts for children that are community based, responsive to family needs and coordinated with other agencies.

- Agreed that the past president and executive director should work in tandem to recommend the composition of an ad hoc committee to develop a long-range vision for Counterpoint for presentation to the Board at the April 1992 meeting and recommend the composition of an editorial board for Counterpoint.

- Agreed to correspond with New American Schools Development Corporation to suggest criteria for evaluation of proposals for design models for new American schools, and recommend that President Steve Kukic represent NASDSE on review panels.

- Directed NASDSE's executive director to explore with OSEP alternative mechanisms for funding out-of-state travel for state personnel and alternative technical assistance possibilities.

- The 1992 annual meeting will take place November 8-12 at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel in Atlanta, GA.

• All sessions were audio-tape recorded; the tapes are available for purchase. (see page 16)

Meeting Needs of Students with Disabilities Through Reform

Special educators met with officials of key national organizations involved in educational reform on Tuesday to explore how reform can meet the needs of students with disabilities. Participants with moderator Vance Engleman of Options International, were:

Ingrid Draper, executive director of special education, Detroit Public Schools;

Ron Field, senior director for education and job training, National Conference of State Legislatures;

Paul Goren, senior policy analyst for education, National Governors' Association;

Marty Orland, associate director for analysis, National Education Goals Panel;

Jo Thomason, executive director, Council of Administrators of Special Education;

Gene Wilhoit, executive director, National Association of State Boards of Education.

Major issues discussed included standards, accountability, systemic change and collaboration with regular education. One major problem presented was how to rally public support for schools at a time when, as Jo Thomason noted, "collectively we don't value children highly." Or as Ingrid Draper asked: "What do we have to do to make children and families a priority?"

Paul Goren noted that the governors are concerned and want an accountable system but "political issues are real ones." NGA does have a tentative agenda for discussing how to raise a sense of urgency among the public. Field agreed that the public has to be sold on the idea that reform is necessary, and questioned how to raise awareness among people at all levels - teachers, parents, PTAs, churches, etc. Marty Orland pointed to a message in the goals report on the relation between how children perform and the future of the United States as an industrial nation, noting that the report underplayed self-interest for everyone.

Gene Wilhoit said that state boards, whose members usually are not educators, recognize they have to make changes because of economic concerns, new demography, and inadequacies in the present system.

"We are committed to the fact that all children should be learning, that we can't afford economically to throw people away. This will have dramatic implications for special education and how it is delivered.

Other points made by the participants were:

Jo Thomason: Greater work must be done in defining measurable outcomes. Without this, special education won't be equal partners or have a basis for inclusion in regular classes with protection. Some are trying to reduce the numbers in special education while other are adding new categories. These converging forces will-affect how reform plays out for us.

Gene Wilhoit: We are converting systems to outcome-based accountability and there are new statements about what students should know which have implications for state staff and structure. But the boards' perception is that we haven't penetrated practice at the local level. Special education is overly represented by sex and race, and some categories are difficult to justify. The serious question for us is whether the system will take responsibility. Regular education needs to make dramatic changes, including special education's focus on the individual child and constant monitoring of a child's progress. I challenge you to show where you are sharing that in a comprehensive way with regular education.

Marty Orland: I think the goals form a reasonably sound framework for reform. Achievement of the goals will put the country on much sounder footing. There are objectives under each goal that reflect a very ambitious blueprint for educational reform. There is an inclusionary aspect to the words so the diversity of cultures and individuals can be easily accommodated. Data and accountability systems are necessary. The data system is inadequate to track progress in terms of goals.

Paul Goren: NGA is calling for systemic change as the embracing concept and strategy, with learning goals tems. We have to identify barriers from the school level up, and look at SEAs managing system change in an era of fiscal constraints.

Ingrid Draper: To look at reform honestly, we must look at how we educate all children. This means main system inclusion, but now I see exclusivity with a growing underclass of students not reaching that level. If special education is apart from reform, there will be greater referral to special education. We need to collaborate with general education as it deals with more at-risk children. The general education system needs to be prepared to deal with the diversity of needs and be flexible enough to meet the needs of a broad-based population.

Ron Field: Legislatures have serious political concerns about educational reform. The primary issue in many states is money. States will not change education; it will be at the district and site level if at all but the state can assist and provide resources. There is a problem of equitable funding among school districts. Systemic reform is necessary but what do you replace the system with? Reforms have to touch those who fall between the cracks.

NASDSE - A Leader in Educational Technology

The NASDSE Board announced its committment to making technology a priority in 1992, through the new video (see box), and by promoting effective use by SEAs and LEAs of applications of technology.

Several prime examples of technology - and support from leading technology companies - were featured at the annual meeting. John Sculley, CEO of Apple Computer, created a special video greeting because he was unable to appear at the meeting.

"Education needs to take bold risks yet be accountable for successes and failures," Sculley said. "We need to distinguish not between regular and special education but between good education and anything less than good education. It is good education if it guides, nudges, suggests, exposes, satisfies teachers and students and doesn't care if the student has a diagnostic label."

Sculley urged creating an environment where you can experiment with new ideas, develop and circulate them.

"I am troubled by the minimal impact of special education in education reform. We need a national dialogue and we need to implement thoughtful application of techniques. The most compelling signs in special education have been the exemplary effect technology can have on regular education."

At the luncheon where NASDSE's video was premiered, Jeff Osowski of New Jersey introduced Lynn Regan, special education resource room teacher in Toms River, NJ, who received the IBM Technological and Learning Teacher of the Year Award. In his introduction, Osowski congratulated IBM for its commitment, stressing that business/school partnerships are essential.

Mrs. Regan emphasized that teaching with technology offers students an opportunity for alternative learning using a multisensory approach.

"Interactive videos enable children in special education to participate in a multisensory environment and adapt it to recreate information in their own learning style. It is customized learning. This is a golden opportunity for special education to help lead in restructuring of the educational system. Teachers come to my classroom to observe, regular students come in to watch them use the computers, and this enables special education students to create an image of themselves to carry them into the future with confidence and pride."

In a special morning session, Dr. Robert Bruce Mahaffey of IBM's Special Needs Systems demonstrated some new products his division has produced. His group develops accessibility and therapy products for daily living and working. They include:

- Thinkable - to give practice in sequential memory and visual discrimination with little clinical supervision for children and adults with basic cognitive dysfunction, developed with occupational therapists, special education teachers, psychologists and speech/language pathologists.
- SpeechViewer II - gives visual feedback on speech with modules on awareness of sound, skill building and patterning, for persons with speech, language and hearing disorders.
- VoiceType Speech Recognition System - to be used with any keyboard application for people who have limited use of their hands.

Mahaffey gave out videotapes of the products. His next mission is learning disabilities and he will work with NASDSE to define requirements of what the program should do, use test sites for early prototype testing, and efficacy testing of the final product. He is at Special Needs Systems, Entry Systems Division, IBM, 1000 N.W. 51st Street, Internal Zip 5432, Boca Raton, FL 33431; tel. (407)982-3887.

NASDSE Premieres New Video

A special presentation during NASDSE's annual meeting was the premiere of "Accessing the 21st Century Through Multimedia," an exciting new 19-minute video produced by NASDSE with a grant from IBM.

The video shows scenes of computer use in the classroom and an interview with William Schipper, NASDSE executive director, on the value of technology in special education. The video was scheduled for showing on the American Disability Channel (cable TV) Nov. 20 and Dec. 11.

Free copies are available from NASDSE for only a postage and handling charge. SEAs are encouraged to obtain the video and to make copies for distribution to LEAs to show to teachers, parents, community groups, other organizations and agencies, etc., to inform them about technology, its promise and responsibility.

The View from the Office of Special Education Programs

Judy Schrag, director of OSEP, related the conference theme to a message on "Inventing the Future for Special Education Within the Context of Education Reform."

"Despite the tremendous gains made to date, special education is not yet fully evolved. Similarly regular education hasn't evolved to its fullest. Unless it is able to deal more easily with diversity, there will be a problem of the delicate balance between procedural focus and the flexibility needed to experiment.

"Experiments to date have been timid but they are getting bolder. Pennsylvania and Vermont, for example, are looking at funding systems independent of labels, driven by needs. For evaluation we may have alternative ways to assess such as portfolios, clusters, curriculum-based, with less relation to labels."

Dr. Schrag stressed that in inventing the future, the answers must start with the right questions:

1. What do we want students to know and be able to do?

To answer this question in terms of outcomes of all students and outcomes unique to students with disabilities, OSEP's activities include:

- National Longitudinal Study;
- National Center on Educational Outcomes at the University of Minnesota;
- National agenda setting for serious emotional disturbances and for severe disabilities;
- State-federal evaluation studies;
- Policy Options Center.

2. What kinds of learning experiences produce these outcomes?

"Teaching as telling" and "learning as recall" are being replaced by opportunities that engage students with authentic and challenging tasks, choice and multiple answers, and flexible grouping. OSEP's response includes:

- Three projects looking at ways to increase home, school and community cooperation;
- Six projects to develop, implement and evaluate school building models for education for all students with mild and severe disabilities and those who are deaf-blind;
- Plans for two national symposia to identify critical issues, best practices and future directions for acquiring effective communication for deaf-blind and students with severe disabilities;
- Cooperative agreements to improve teacher planning and to analyze and adapt general education curricula in math, science, social studies and language arts;
- Four ADD centers funded for assessment, identification and interventions;
- Five assistive technology projects;
- Early Childhood Institutes for studies on prenatal exposure, intervention and dissemination;

3. What does it take to transform schools into places where student outcomes are enhanced?

Issues include changing roles and responsibilities to fit new patterns, increasing access to knowledge, finding the best way to infuse special education into regular education, creating technology-rich environments.

OSEP activities include:

- System change grants on severe disabilities - and a State Networking Meeting on Severe Disabilities planned Feb. 11-12 in Washington as part of long-range planning;
- HHS/OSERS cooperative initiative on integrated service delivery;
- Enhanced services for students who are deaf;
- 5-year cooperative agreements with vocational rehabilitation;
- Qualified personnel. A draft National Personnel Agenda was distributed for input;
- Improved retention of special education teachers;
- Minority outreach centers;
- Parent training and information centers.

4. How will we know if we are successful? What kinds of accountability are needed to assure a positive relationship between our services and interventions and improved student outcomes and other desired results?

Stressing that accountability is the central aspect of education reform, Dr. Schrag cited assessment changes; teacher assessment and increased certification standards plus incentives for professional growth; flexibility from rules; decentralization; incentives for reform; report cards of results and benefits for change.

OSEP projects in response are:

- National Center on Educational Outcomes
- NASDSE subcontract to look at state accountability systems and models;
- Chapter 1/Special Education Federal coordination;
- Non-supplanting Federal rule change.

Students with Serious Emotional Disturbances:

Setting a National Agenda ... and a Teleconference

A panel discussion on Monday on setting a national agenda for students with serious emotional disturbances was followed in the evening by a nationally telecast video teleconference with a CEC meeting taking place in New Orleans.

At the general session, Trina Osher of NASDSE explained that NASDSE has been working with OSEP and the State Mental Health Representatives for Children and Youth (SMHRCY) as part of an effort to inform state directors and encourage their commitment to the national agenda on policy issues concerning this population.

An electronic town meeting teleconference July 25 elicited public reactions to draft focus agenda statements developed by OSEP as part of its mission statement for the program for children and youth with serious emotional disturbance. OSEP allocated $2 million this year and $4 million next year.

Information distributed at the session included a Profile of Children and Youth Classified as Seriously Emotionally Disturbed, and statements by NASDSE and the Mental Health and Special Education Coalition on changing the federal definition under IDEA.

Changes in Focus Statement

Marty Kaufman, director, OSEP Division on Innovation and Development, reported that about 1,400 comments from the teleconference are helping to give greater definition and refinement to the focus statements. Among the changes he cited:

- "Positive learning opportunities" for students has been changed to "positive learning experiences."
- "Systemic change" is now "systemic linking," to emphasize multisystems that link education with other programs and services.
- "Support for families" has become "family friendly services."
- "Professional development" - "and support" was added to denote not just managing behavior but achieving possible outcomes.
- The agenda item on "empowerment" was dropped because it is inherent in the other items.
- "Counteracting risk factors" was added to stress early intervention and identification.
- "Integration and reintegration" were added to emphasize the need for more special support to bring children back to the school system.

Next steps, he said, include developing specific initiatives to achieve the focus statements.

Collaboration Mandated in Kentucky

Paul Andis of Kentucky Department for Mental Health and Mental Retardation Services discussed the importance of interagency collaboration and systemic linking to work together at all levels of program development, implementation and delivery. He explained that Kentucky mandates interagency collaboration between mental health, education, child welfare and the courts.

A one-year experimental project is starting from the ground up not just to link but to enable moving from one system to another and to develop the attitude that working together can be more effective than working separately. Families were included as active partners in the process at every stage from the state level to multicounty regional councils down to treatment planning.

"I would like to see this strengthened in the statements. We need to change how we think about provision of services. We agree in principle with every point and we are trying to implement them."

Priority Areas Set in Arkansas

Ann Patterson of the Arkansas Division of Mental Health Services described collaborative efforts with special education including legislation developed to use state special education dollars to provide school-based services for non-IDEA students. The Governor appointed a coalition to look at service issues including special education, health, mental health, child welfare, substance abuse and parents.

"They identified four priority areas: school-based treatment services, case management, therapeutic foster care, and crisis services, with one agency taking the lead in developing standards for an area. Eligibility into the system is a crucial point to look at, as well as flexible funding issues. We support the newly identified agenda on integration. It is very important that special education and mental health enhance regular education's capacity to address these issues."

Vertical Response in Louisiana

Ron Boudreaux of Louisiana Department of Health and Hospitals reported that the state cabinet officials in education, social services, child welfare, mental health and juvenile justice made a tape for LEAs

saying in effect: "We want you to sit down together and look at children at high risk. You have to stretch your resources to meet their needs and work collaboratively."

At meetings scheduled on an individual child, the child and a family member must be present, and a voluntary family advocate is assigned to attend. They develop an interagency family service plan with the agency signing off on the plan and resources to meet it. This empowers local people to say back to the state: we now know the needs but you have to help with resources. This is a vertical response.

"You should be prepared to make a long-term investment. It doesn't happen quickly. It doesn't take a lot of money to collaborate well but it takes a little; at the local level, even $5-10,000 can mean a lot."

He expressed concern that Part H will be viewed narrowly.

"In Louisiana we hedged. We focus on biologically disabled infants and toddlers. But we want to see it expanded to include environmentally at risk so we can begin to incorporate them. If we accept that as a target population, we will force other agencies to comply."

Maine, Utah Report on Programs

David Stockford, state director for **Maine,** noted that dropouts are a key problem and stressed the need to focus on aspirations to empower the child.

"A high percentage of children classified is the result of overt behavior of parents and the impact on school performance as a result of abuse in the home (child, substance) not necessarily of or by the child."

He also noted that the population complexity is awesome. In Maine, agencies sponsored joint conferences, defined the target population jointly, coordinated cross-site visits, tracked children in both mental health and education systems to detail joint outcomes, and held a two-day parents meeting which parents planned and presented with a focus on siblings.

"Prevention is key. We cannot not invest some resources in that. I suggest assessment right after birth to determine resources that will be needed."

Steve Kukic of **Utah** emphasized the importance of what the Surgeon General's statement in 1988 called "comprehensive, coordinated, family-centered and community-based services." Utah has pre-referral guidelines on behavioral disorders, an academy for teachers, a national peer review panel on violent students on retainer to be called on when needed, heavy involvement with mental health developing a child's mental health plan and advocating for more fiscal support.

The state has a mandate for coordination for people with disabilities including special education and mental health directors who meet to resolve interagency concerns and a voluntary task force for children and youth at risk, which includes health, child welfare and corrections as well. Local coordinating councils try to solve their own interagency problems and if they can't, they come to the state council for assistance.

The state has a systems change grant and will move students with severe learning and emotional disabilities to the least restrictive setting and develop school-wide models.

"As an individual response, I am personally involved as state director. I don't delegate. I view collaboration as a high priority. We need mandated services for children with mental health needs. We need to remember that special education is not the answer to everything. NASDSE's response is to have ongoing involvement and continued partnership with SMHRCY and to bring parents in to the partnership.

NASDSE Joins CEC in Video Teleconference On Early Interventions

Participants in the NASDSE annual meeting shared their perspectives about early intervention for students with behavioral and emotional problems with attendees at a CEC Topical Conference on At-Risk Children and Youth, taking place in New Orleans, via a video teleconference Monday evening.

The program was hosted by CEC's ERIC/OSEP Special Project, and the program was telecast via satellite to sites in the U.S. and Canada. Videotapes of the teleconference are available from ERIC/CEC which also has additional resources and references on the at-risk child. For information, call (703)264-9489; fax (703)264-9494.

Opening the program, Dr. Judy Schrag, OSEP director, stressed that the problem of this population is a collective challenge.

"It is not a federal issue. The solution must be implemented at the local building, with support from state, federal and local."

Marty Kaufman, director, OSEP Division of Innovation and Development which funds the ERIC/OSEP Special Project, called the 1990 amendments authorizing a new program for children and youth with severe emotional disturbance a "bold initiative" to focus activities on this group and to counteract risk factors.

"Schools must break the current mold and go beyond traditional needs to meet social and emotional needs as a foundation on which children will realize their potential. We hope the teleconference will provide confidence for school personnel and teachers to act. We view it as a call for action to assume responsibility on the basis of knowledge and information."

Statements by participants included the following:

David Stockford, ME: We do have capacity to identify students early especially with involvement of regular teachers and parents. Falling grades are used too often. Staff development is essential to change the system not just the structure. We must recognize the critical role of parents.

Jim Tucker, PA: Pennsylvania, Louisiana, Connecticut and Texas are experimenting with early identification. Effective screening allows us through proper use of instruction to determine if it is an instructional problem and screen out to a remedial program, then see if a correctional program can be instituted. We need to bring a student to a level of comfort so the student will go into a task knowing he will be successful. Academic vs. behavioral would be no issue if we had no labels.

Steve Kukic, UT: The system is not flexible enough to accommodate the diversity of needs. There are good systematic screening procedures and pre-referral intervention such as Project RIDE (Responding to Individual Differences in Education) and school assistance teams. We need school-based interagency reform initiatives on the classroom level and use of instructional tools with frequent monitoring. Intervention should be student centered not label centered. Some see behavioral management as an end. We need targeted intervention to teach skills needed to succeed in the classroom. State and local interagency collaboration is not a buzz word. There is a need for shared vision among teachers, administrators, etc. Utah has more than 30 schools providing an interagency pool of funds to form school communities all working together.

Kay Lund, AZ: Collaboration is absolutely necessary. Education can't do it alone nor do we want to. Real effective collaboration requires sticking with it, nurturing it at all levels, and providing ongoing inservice because team members change. We need to appreciate our disciplinary differences and have consultants come in to the classroom to teach how to do it, then we have more chance for lasting impact. Part of the team must be families. We have to move beyond traditional health services. In Arizona, we have had an influx of street gangs so we are working with the police.

Vicki Phillips, KY SEA: Building-based problem-solving teams, called teacher or student assistance teams, are the focus of a proactive response. Buildings recognize they must engage parents and other agencies and services to coordinate mental health and service programs into the schools on an as-needed basis. This creates shared responsibility, so they all own the process, and promotes the idea of pooling human and fiscal resources and immediate access to services to get children early. It requires a high degree of collaboration and skill development, but provides measurable results. We have to teach teachers to enhance their own skills through professional development. The collective expertise of teachers is considerable.

Nancy Thabet (WV): Ongoing support of the teacher by parents, administrators, community is vital; it can be a very draining job. We need to find ways to give this so they don't feel they are alone.

Shelley Hamler, OH: As a principal of an alternative school, I feel we must make students realize what they can do and stop making them feel they cannot succeed. We got state and district support, set up intervention assistance teams, involve parents and the board of education, and set criteria for referral. Teachers don't see it as a threat.

Glenn Latham, MPRRC: Schools don't always buy into programs and keep looking for something completely new. You need to have the local board buy in and identify systems that work and stick with them, making incremental changes based on new ideas.

Inventing the Future in the States:
New Jersey, Iowa, Virginia, Kentucky, Oklahoma, New Hampshire

Concurrent sessions described examples of reform at the state level: in the service delivery system, within the state education agency, and in a partnership to produce student outcome information.

Reform in the Service Delivery System

Jeff Osowski of **New Jersey** described a pilot project in 13 LEAs, now in the implementation stage, which moved from a disability labeling system to a program-based categorical model. Special features of the model are:

- Building-based decision-making committees, including the principal;
- School resource committees with one special educator to build capacity in regular education;
- Highly focused training to develop principal as instructional leader;
- Family-centered coordinated system of early intervention services drawing on multiple sources of service and funding;
- Functional curriculum-based assessment in multidisciplinary evaluation model, including observation and interviews with teachers and parents;
- Educational impact made an important part of eligibility criteria rather than tied solely to a disability diagnosis;
- Monitoring system focused on outcomes, accountability and assistance to LEAs;
- Actions to establish inclusive education in age appropriate, regular classes in neighborhood schools; this includes funding of related services and teachers' aides in inclusive education settings when no traditional special education program is provided; itinerant special education services for preschool children in regular settings such as Head Start and nursery schools; modification of regulations to make it clear that inclusion must be first choice in placement; innovative program structure to use collaborative or team teaching, etc.

The pilot found that special education referrals decreased by 20 percent in two years, eligibility criteria were clearer, regular education took ownership, and skills and confidence of regular teachers grew so they could focus more on remedial activities. It also showed improved academic, work and social skills

Keys to successful implementation are, according to Osowski:

1. Partnerships with LEAs,
2. Field testing in a real school district,
3. Adequate funding,
4. Training and field-based assistance focused on key persons, e.g. principals for building-based teams,
5. Recognition of the power structure and relying on it rather than trying to change it.

Frank Vance of **Iowa** described the state's Renewed Service Delivery System, started at four trial sites in Area Education Agencies (AEA), now involving 14 of the 15 AEAs. The program integrates resources and services of general, compensatory and special education, with the following key practices:

- Expanded options for all students,
- Ongoing process to plan services,
- Better coordination of services and fuller utilization of personnel,
- Improved outcomes,
- More emphasis on programs and problem-solving,
- Curriculum based,
- Frequent evaluation of progress, at least weekly,
- Building-level plans tailored to each student,
- Greater parent involvement in decision making.
- Sufficient staff development.

No new dollars are being used, with state dollars primarily used for staff development including use of substitute teachers. Financial support is based on general education enrollment, with $3 per child the first year, $2 the second year, $1 the third year. For program assessment, $20,000 is allocated to each AEA for a part-time program evaluator; Iowa State University will conduct overall evaluation.

Iowa is collecting baseline data in every AEA and will reevaluate student progress periodically. The first survey was on attitudes and perceptions, and a survey in February will see how these have changed. The first student outcome data will be available next July.

Reform in the SEA

Austin Tuning of **Virginia** reported that the new governor last year revised the Department of Education, holding each school division accountable for student learning and achievement, focusing technical assistance on those who need it most, and basing assessment of the program on predefined goals. The reorganized department is headed by a Superintendent

of Public Instruction with three assistant Superintendents (Student Services; Research, Policy Development and Information Systems; and Administrative Services).

Special education personnel fall under eight divisions in these departments rather than forming a separate division. Tuning is lead educational specialist for special education. The dual school system was dissolved and a unified system created. A University Consortium for Research and Professional Development also was formed. The state was divided into 10 regional service units with one person in each to work with LEAs as a resource person.

A team concept was established to develop proposals on specific issues to be submitted for approval to a management team of division chiefs. The organizational structure lends itself to working with regular education because every activity team on special education must include a regular educator.

In **Kentucky,** Michael Miller explained, after the Supreme Court ruled that the state system was unconstitutional, a new law was passed and a new Department of Education was established; 20-30% of personnel was not rehired and 20-30% left on their own. Under the State Board and Commissioner of Education are a Deputy Commissioner/Chief of Staff and Deputy Commissioners for Management Support Services, Learning Results Services (includes Kentucky Schools for Blind and Deaf), and Learning Support Services.

All other special education services come under the last unit, which includes learning program development (early childhood, instructional technology and curriculum development); learning program delivery (regular education); special instructional services (exceptional children's services); and teacher education and certification. Contracts with each division will assure that staff devotes part of their time to exceptional children, although thus far no exceptional children staff person is working with professional development.

Jim Newby of **Oklahoma** described the special education section structure which sets up work teams determined by the section staff with leader, co-leader and team members who are each assigned to be a single point of contact with the LEA and state-supported schools, and liaison assignments with Counterpoint, CEC, and other state agencies (mental health, human services, adult education, etc.)

"As a leader and member of the work team, each person gets an evaluation from peers so it is more meaningful. There used to be 12 lines of supervision in special education alone, but nobody knew what anyone else knew and if one person left, the structure collapsed."

Work teams are formed on applications, best practices, compliance, data, early childhood, grants, interagency/legislative relations, LRE/regular education, parents, personnel issues, reporting/information/dissemination/section operations, SpecialNet, State Plan - B, State Plan - H, and Transition.

Newby suggested it would be useful to have NASDSE collect organizational charts of SEAs and descriptions of how they work as a resource.

The Power of Student Outcome Information

Robert Kennedy of **New Hampshire** joined with Mary Ann Lachat and Martha Williams of the Center for Resource Management, South Hampton, NH, for this discussion of a the New Hampshire Special Education Program Improvement Partnership, which has been funded since 1985 by the SEA. It currently includes 108 schools from 22% of LEAs. over 3,000 regular education staff, 500 special education staff, and 2,000 parents have participated in local assessments of program effectiveness.

Services to districts include:

- training and on-site technical assistance;
- regional training on use of Special Education Information System (SPEDIS);
- information services;
- networking activities including state and regional meetings;
- written materials and publications including "Program Improvement Notes" and "Effective Practices in Place."

Kennedy outlined these features of the partnership:

1. Expanded technical assistance to special education in LEAs,
2. Responsive to LEA interests and concerns,
3. Promotes database planning for program improvement,
4. Promotes integration of regular and special education,
5. Widespread participation across the state,
6. Long-term commitment for systemic change.

A Student Outcome Information System produces data on student outcomes, such as how special education students perform in major subject areas at all grade levels, whether performance is declining at key transition points, performance on tests and assessments, progress in specific placements, absences and suspensions or other disciplinary actions compared to regular education peers, longitudinal absence, retention, suspension, performance and dropout rates.

Meeting the Needs of Students Through Section 504

Specific problems involved in meeting Section 504 requirements were discussed by panelists at a Tuesday session (see October Liaison Bulletin devoted to 504).

"Section 504 extends beyond what is considered normal special education under IDEA," stated Charles Weatherly, Esq., of Weekes and Candler in Georgia, who is a counsel for school districts. "It is critical to have regular education ownership and funding in this process. I advise that the regular school has the responsibility to develop 504 plans. I recommend you don't adopt all procedural requirements of IDEA as part of 504 procedures. You can do it but then you are by policy conferring that right on the student although the law does not require it."

Weatherly stressed that Section 504 covers all students identified under IDEA but many other categories as well:

- alcohol and drug addiction
- diseases (e.g. hepatitis B, TB, AIDS, asthma, juvenile rheumatoid arthritis)
- temporary handicaps
- social maladjustment
- ADD, even if not otherwise disabled.

As a nondiscrimination statute, 504 is administered by the Office of Civil Rights. It is a comparative analysis statute, stating that if a service is given to nonhandicapped it must also be made available to the handicapped, with reasonable accommodation such as comparable facilities, transportation. It also extends beyond this to residential placement. The section requires a child find process with evaluation in a nondiscriminatory manner. Procedural safeguards include rights to parents and children for notices, examining records, hearing, impartial review process.

David Rostetter of Education Policy and Program Solutions stated that Section 504 is growing in a gray area between regular and special education.

"Policy can be murky. It gives a message to state and local boards that everyone is responsible for these children. In the context of reform, 504 is increasingly important and Part B increasingly unimportant."

He noted that 504 and Part B parallel each other. OSEP assures Part B by monitoring SEAs, which are guarantors of rights. OCR has a different responsibility. To the extent SEAs don't fulfill their responsibility under Part B, Section 504 grows in importance.

"You need to look at 504 and OCR and get agreements so the lines of responsibility are clearer and you see where children fall. The statutes overlap; OCR and OSEP could be investigating the same issues, leading to dual hearings and appeals. It is an administrative quagmire."

Jim Tucker of **Pennsylvania** reported that the state has two laws on education both assigned to his office: Chapter 15 relates to "protected handicapped students" under 504; Chapter 14 defines special education as "specially designed instruction." His staff has to keep a log of time spent on 504 if the student comes under IDEA because auditors do not allow federal dollars to be spent in administering 504 regulations.

"This provides a powerful option. Procedures are much simpler and we are able to get services directly to students more easily. A child who needs some service due to a handicap but does not need specially designed instruction is a Chapter 15 student."

Distinctions will be difficult when it comes to a need for related services. If parents disagree on 504 service, procedural safeguards are by law those under Chapter 14. There can be an informal conference and then formal due process.

"We believe this allows us options that support a needs-driven system versus an eligibility driven system. The future will be determined by meeting needs, not by a diagnostic definition that then limits our ability to meet needs."

David Stockford of **Maine** said the state initiated an innovative approach in 1990 with a revision of special education rules to extend affirmative rights of Part B to the 504 population. Promising practices include:

- Complaint Management System developed to investigate complaints. Printed guidelines include definitions, procedures for complaint review, investigation fact-finding meeting, report, appeal, compliance activities, due process hearing and enforcement.
- Involvement of protection and advocacy teams.
- Student assistance teams under cooperative agreement for early intervention
- Consumer information technology and training exchange to train teachers and community under a technology grant.
- Hearing officers training.
- Interdepartmental coordination.

Personnel Needs: Multiple Perspectives and Responses

Lynne Cook and Kathleen Hebbeler of the National Clearinghouse for Professions in Special Education, operated collaboratively by NASDSE and CEC, led the general session on personnel needs with statistical reports on teacher shortages and attrition.

"Teacher attrition statistics can be meaningless," Kathy Hebbeler pointed out, "becsuse attrition can mean moving to regular education, going to another career, retiring, going to another job category in special education, staying home with children, going to another school or district or state. We need to put the statistics into context for policy implications. The number of teachers leaving the profession is of most concern."

Latest data (1988-89) reported by states to OSEP showed 4.6 million special education students, rising in an accelerated curve, with about 300,000 FTE special education teachers. Ratios of student to teacher - about 15 to 1 - and of teachers employed to those needed - for every 10 employed, one more is needed - show a consistent trend nationally.

"But the state picture shows great variability. At random, for example, Washington State only needed one more teacher for every 42 employed, but Missouri and Florida each needed another for every four employed."

The National Center for Education Statistics last summer surveyed a sample of teachers leaving education and found that 5.6% left teaching, 7.3% left special education. Of those who left, 27% stayed home, 25% retired, 18% went to a career outside education, 17% to a career in education other than teaching.

Lynne Cook stressed the need to understand why personnel leave. Summarizing research by Billingsley, Cross, Boe, NCES and others, she cited teachers' most frequent reasons for leaving special education as:

- need for change (administrative policies did not give options or allow a year off);
- excessive paperwork;
- lack of administrative support;
- increased student diversity and the broader range of disability;
- too much time with the same students (options might be collaboration, team teaching, rotation);
- disruptive students;
- excessive caseload;
- special education policies (often thought to be too rigid);
- professional isolation (exacerbated when there is only one special education teacher in the building).

"Meeting personnel needs in special education will require collaboration among key stakeholders based on an understanding of each other's vocabulary and perspectives. Definitions differ between regular and special education, between professional and policy boards, and from state to state. Just as attrition has different meanings based on one's perspective, terminology associated with personnel qualifications (e.g., licensure, certification, accreditation and program approval) is often used with multiple meanings.

Marianne Kirner, director of the Special Education Resource Center in **Connecticut,** described the strong collaboration in the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD). She described the CSPD Committee's participation in a CEC institute on strategic planning, followed by participation with professional and parent groups in a symposium on Special Eduction for the 21st Century which included personnel needs.

As a result of rethinking of direction, the principals' organization is developing a cadre of trained principals to advise in personnel preparation program, two state universities are working on a federal proposal for speech-language pathologists, another is collaborating on multidisciplinary personnel preparation, and the State Advisory Council on Special Education has asked CSPD/SERC to facilitate their working on planning.

Frank New, **Ohio** state director, stressed that meeting personnel needs requires everyone's participation: Administration, teachers' groups and professional associations. He reported that the SEA is now partners with two teachers unions representing 51,000 teachers, more than half in the state, to gather thoughtful information and explore changes needed in the system. He stressed the need for NASDSE as an organization to be involved and work together with CEC's professional standards to get the best information to put power behind the effort.

A packet was distributed on "National Resources for Addressing Personnel Issues," describing Clearinghouse activities; NASDSE CSPD Technical Assistance Project; Westat Design of OSEP Strategy for Meeting Personnel Data Requirements; CEC Institute on CSPD Collaboration; SpecialNet Bulletin Boards on Supply and Demand and on Recruitment/Retention; manual on "Planned Change for Personnel Development; Strategic Planning and the CSPD;" and Project SESPE (Special Education Supply of Preservice Educators).

Multicultural Issues and Minority Over-Representation

"Culture frequently is defined in anthropological or sociological terms," explained Myron Jones of Development Associates in Virginia, "so we wind up thinking by default as anthropologists instead of thinking with a combination of our heads and our hearts. Culture is only local. Hispanics in San Antonio are not the same as wealthy Cubans in Miami. We need to take into account that culture is local right down to the neighborhood, the block, the house and the family."

People consistently reject people on a class basis, not necessarily a cultural or ethnic basis, he added. Noting that people gravitate naturally toward people who are "like us," and wonder why "others" do something in a certain way, Jones emphasized that there is no automatic identity people can like and respect.

"The real difficulty is that we see what is "other" about students and we read things into that. We see qualities and characteristics of a child and assume they mean one thing when they may mean nothing of the kind. The real issue is not if we can develop culturally appropriate tests but if we can develop tests to measure real gifts. Teachers should be sure they don't read into differences a difference in intelligence."

Is there over-representation of minorities in special education? Or is there a disproportion? This general session was led by Diane Sydoriak, **Arkansas** state director, who was concerned about a second generation of desegregation lawsuits and a local newspaper story listing all LEAs with the numbers of minorities in special education. She surveyed SEA directors last spring on whether they gathered data by race and sex. The survey, which had a 100% response, showed that 23 SEAs do, 7 have procedures to red flag districts with possible over-representation of minorities, and one has legislation and rules/regulations to address the issue.

She paid for directors from IL, MA, MS, MD and PA to meet together last June for further discussion, which led to this special session.

"We realized this can't be dealt with as a special education issue. But regular education is not meeting the diverse needs of children with the changing demography in the schools. We need to work cooperatively in reform to assist and empower teachers to meet the entirety of this diversity."

Attendees formed small discussion groups to generate suggestions of what could be done at local, state and organizational levels. Group comments included the following:

- Get consistency in data collection;
- Good state professional development to train teachers to work with individual differences and perceptions;
- More awareness by LEAs that this is a problem;
- States should clarify and define the problem;
- See that the issue is included in school performance standards, out of the special education arena, as part of school restructuring;
- Look at building level for intervention and identification;
- Create better grant programs to identify exemplary programs.

"We have a problem and a need," concluded Sydoriak. "Litigation is too costly and too adversarial. But even more important, what is right for children has to be the guiding principle."

"Grow Deep, Not Just Tall"

Karen Kaiser Clark of the Center for Executive Planning in Minnesota, whose is an author and school consultant, used that title for her keynote address.

She stressed the importance of seeing how children view the world and of seeing the child within oneself.

"One of the most important questions in education is to ask ourselves and our students: What is your self image? What adjectives would you choose to describe yourself? What would your administrator choose? What do we look for?"

She also emphasized the need for a sense of humor and a sense of wonder about life and people.

"We connect with words. What do we value? What does it mean to be a successful treasurable human being? Your touching is never negligible! It always counts."

Business Meeting Highlights Achievements, Issues

NASDSE President Tom Gillung reviewed achievements during the past year, which included:

- Move to Alexandria with improved meeting facilities and financial advantage;
- $2+ million in revenues for NASDSE;
- Increased involvement in broader range of issues related to education of individuals with disabilities resulting in increased participation with organizations from other sectors of education and human service delivery systems;
- Advertising and Public Relations unit established;
- Strategic planning by board and staff;
- Testimony and legislation on infants exposed to drugs in utero;
- Action Seminars held on adapted physical education and education of deaf students;
- Installation of computer network system in offices;
- Executive Director citation for outstanding public service by CEC;
- Personnel network established with 1,500 new special educators;

Challenges for the Future

Tom Gillung cited these challenges for the future:

- Determining how children with disabilities will participate in the educational reform movement and what role special education will play;
- Finding ways to take advantage of the cultural diversity of a changing student population;
- Striving to enhance the quality of teachers entering the profession;
- Forging better working relationships with associations representing regular education;
- Strengthening relations with Congress;
- Achieving financial stability and security for the association

The treasurer's report showed revenues of $2,116,000 in 1991 of which 44% came from federal projects. Expenses totaled $2,1011,086, of which 43% were salaries and fringe benefits. Non-restricted funds were $783,000, and the building fund has $61,800.

Gillung announced that there are 13 new state directors since the last meeting. There were 12 in 1989-90, 72 in the last 72 months.

Voting on proposed amendments to the NASDSE Constitution and Bylaws, the membership voted that membership in NASDSE is open to each state, each state director and each SEA staff, defined as follows:

State Director - "any person designated by the SEA who has specific responsibility for directing, coordinating, or supervising programs and services regarding the education of individuals with disabilities.

SEA Staff - "any person employed by the SEA who has responsibility for directing, coordinating, or supervising programs and services regarding the education of individuals with disabilities."

State in good standing - "a state that has paid or has committed itself to pay full membership dues or equivalent of dues as determined by the board." A previous amendment change defined "state" as including "the States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and other federal jurisdictions, as specified in IDEA."

Another amendment change states that affiliates of the Association "shall include those persons, not defined as a State Director of SEA Staff, who choose to identify with NASDSE..."

Update on Governmental Relations

Linda Lewis of NASDSE discussed legislative initiatives and governmental activities at the Sunday business meeting. Guidelines for NASDSE activities in 1971 have been to:

1. Continue major emphasis on IDEA authorization,

Kukic Assumes Presidency, Patrick Campbell President-Elect

Steve Kukic of Utah was installed as president of NASDSE for 1991-92, with Patrick Campbell of California who was elected president-elect at the Sunday business meeting. Three new members of the Board of Directors are Jim Newby of Oklahoma, three-year term; Gale Lieberman of Illinois and James Tucker of Pennsylvania, two-year terms. Other members of the Board are Tom Gillung (CT), past president; Larry Gloeckler (NY), secretary-treasurer; and John Heskett (MO).

administration and appropriations;

2. Expand scope of policy and program interests, including Higher Education Act and national education reform initiatives;

3. Expand development of cooperative relationships with other organizations and agencies in education and other areas, including mental health community, Part H coordinators, National Conference of State Legislators, National Governors Association;

4. Improve communications with NASDSE members and others.

Chief legislative initiatives included IDEA amendments, proposed amendments to Higher Education Act, America 2000 proposals, and new definition for children with emotional disturbance.

Some highlights of her presentation follow:

• IDEA Amendments - NPRM is expected by January, regulations by March with a July 1 effective date, except that the cap on administration applies to grants after July 1, 1991 and states can implement the amendments before next July if they wish.

• Transition: Part H to preschool - Part B state plan must address transition. Preschool funds can be used for FAPE for eligible two-year-olds who will turn 3 during the school year; Part H does not apply to them. Part H applications must address transition. Part H funds can be used to provide FAPE to children from 3rd birthday to beginning of fall school year. A conference is required between LEA/IU and parents at least 90 days before the child's eligibility for Part B to be sure an IEP or IFSP is in place on the 3rd birthday.

• Higher Education proposed amendments - would provide funds for training and information for school personnel to improve knowledge base and for model service delivery. Other provisions would establish IHE/school partnerships to identify and advise students with disabilities on postsecondary opportunities (model grants program of about $10 million); offer better access and equity through telecommunications; make students eligible for Pell grants even if they take only 6 hours, and will include in cost estimates costs for personal attendant, assistive devices, etc.; faculty development grants to prepare them to provide services; clearinghouse on audio materials to help set national standards. NASDSE issued a strong statement favoring the bill especially for attention to increasing access to higher education.

• Office for Civil Rights of Department of Education -OCR is proposing to increase the information requested in forms collected every two years (e.g., number of 504 eligible students, placements of children served under Part B). NASDSE will send SEAs draft of proposed form which will not be open for public comment until it goes to OMB for approval.

• Attention Deficit Disorders - OSEP clarified school responsibilities under Part B in a memo Sept. 16 to Chief State School Officers. For FY 92, Congress earmarked $1 million of the IDEA research budget to continue ADD Centers (Part E) and $1.5 million for training school personnel (Part D). OSEP has asked NASDSE and others to consider how to utilize information developed and to develop materials to be used in a variety of training sites.

• 1992 appropriations - If Congress passes a continuing resolution, the proposed House-Senate conference amount for FY 1992 state grants, $1,976,090, will be decreased to $1,854,210, the amount appropriated for FY 1991.

National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc.

1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320, Alexandria, Virginia 22314

FIRST CLASS

LEADERSHIP IN A TIME OF CHAOS

THE BEST WAY TO PREDICT THE FUTURE IS TO INVENT IT

1991 **NASDSE** ANNUAL CONFERENCE

ON AUDIO CASSETTE

N/A 1: New State Directors Academy ($12.00)

____ 2: Welcome Address ($9.00)

____ 3: *"Grow Deep, Not Just Tall"* - Karen Kaiser Clark ($13.00)

____ 4: Reform in the Service Delivery System ($9.00)

____ 5: Reform in the SEA ($9.00)

____ 6: The Power of Student Outcome Information in Education Reform ($9.00)

____ 7: Multicultural Issues & Minority Over-Representation in Special Education ($13.00)

____ 8: Setting A National Agenda for Students with Serious Emotional Disturbance ($13.00)

____ 9: Early Intervention for Students with Behavioral & Emotional Problems ($13.00)

____ 10: Personnel Shortages: Multiple Perspectives ($9.00)

____ 11: Meeting the Needs of Students with Disabilities through Section 504 ($9.00)

____ 12: The View from the Office of Special Education Programs ($9.00)

____ 13: Meeting the Needs of Students with Disabilities Through Reform ($13.00)

____ 14: Applications of New Technology for Students with Disabilities ($9.00)

FULL SET PRICE: $120.00

To order by mail, send check or PO to:

CONVENTION RECORD PO BOX 43432 LOUISVILLE KY 40253 502 245-7981

SHIP & BILL TO:

_____

_____

_____

_____